

49. The device of claim 40, wherein the surface of the haptic core at least on the distal end has been treated before the coating has been applied by contacting the haptic core with an adhesion promoter effective to enhance the bond strength of the polyimide coating to the haptic.

50. The device of claim 49 wherein the adhesion promoter is a primer component.

ai Sub D11  
51. The device of claim 40, wherein the polyimide coating is formed by treating at least a portion of the surface of the haptic, applying a photocurable polyimide pre-cursor to the treated region, and curing the polyimide pre-cursor.

52. The device of claim 51 wherein the treating comprises exposing the region to a primer component, a corona electrical discharge, a gas plasma or a chemical etching.

53. The device of claim 51 wherein the polyimide pre-cursor is photocurable by exposure to actinic radiation.

---

#### **REMARKS**

With the addition of the above amendment, claims 1-53 are now pending. No new matter has been added by this amendment. After consideration of the following remarks, the application should be ready for examination on the merits.

#### **RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT**

In response to the Restriction/Election Requirement mailed September 20, 2000, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-27, drawn to a device for implantation. This election is made with traverse.

The Examiner asserts that Group II claims 28-39 are drawn to a different invention--a method for enhancing the anchoring ability of a device. Applicants note that independent method claim 28 of the invention of Group II includes the limitation of

"applying a photocurable polyimide precursor." However, Applicants point out that a similar limitation is found in claim 2 of Group I. Thus, any search that the Examiner conducts for the invention of Group I, and in particular for claim 2, would then overlap any search needed for the claims of Group II. Accordingly, there would be no added burden on the Examiner to examine claims of both Group I and Group II inventions, and the groups should be examined together pursuant to MPEP § 808.02(c).


Further, applicants provisionally elect the species of "intraocular lens." Applicants assert that claim 23 is generic to all the listed species. Therefore, should claim 23 be found allowable, Applicants request that claims to all species be allowed.

In accordance with the provisional election of Group I, Applicants believe that original claims 1-23 and new claims 40-53 read on the species of intraocular lens. But should the restriction requirement between Groups I and II be withdrawn, Applicants believe that claims 28-39 also read on this elected species.

Applicants believe the above remarks completely respond to the Examiner's requirements. Should there be any additional matters to discuss, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-20-00

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc V. Richards  
Reg. No. 37,921  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P. O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200